DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 305 852 HE 022 387

AUTHOR McGuinness, Aims C., Jr.
TITLE The Search for More Effective State Policy Leadership in Higher Education. Recent State Higher Education Studies and Trends in Coordination and Governance.
INSTITUTION Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo.
REPORT NO ECS-PS-86-1
PUB DATE May 86
NOTE 51p.
AVAILABLE FROM Distribution Center, Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln St., Suite 300, Denver, CO 80295 ($2.50, order number PS-86-1).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blue Ribbon Commissions; College Administration; *College Planning; Economic Factors; *Educational Policy; *Governance; *Higher Education; Public Schools; State Action; State Aid; *State Colleges; State Universities; *Statewide Planning

ABSTRACT

An overview of state studies and blue-ribbon commissions on higher education is presented, with an analysis of the motivating issues, which include the need for a strong tie between higher education and the state's economy and the recognition of the connection between the quality of higher education and the quality of the public schools. The status of higher education in the states with regard to the broad categories of "consolidated governing board" and "coordinating board" is summarized, and a number of issues relating to coordination and governance are discussed, including: (1) changes in state structure (from the early 1970's to the present); (2) coordination versus governance; (3) new themes in proposals for improved state coordination (including continuing interest in decentralization and deregulation and continuing attention to mission differentiation and ways to encourage diversity); and (4) points to consider related to coordination (including the view of organization structure and reorganization as means rather than ends and the examination of the total higher education policy process, not just the formal structure). Several suggestions for blue ribbon commissions or task forces are made, including taking an "all one system" approach, comprehensively viewing the effects of the system of finance, and distinguishing between system issues and institutional issues. An appendix summarizes major state higher education studies from 1980 to the present. Contains 9 references. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED305852

THE SEARCH FOR MORE EFFECTIVE STATE POLICY LEADERSHIP IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Recent State Higher Education Studies and Trends in Coordination and Governance

PS-86-1

By

Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDUCATION COMMISSION OF THE STATES

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

HE 022 387

Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

May 1986

Additional copies of this report (PS-86-1) may be obtained for $2.50 from the Distribution Center, Education Commission of the States, Suite 300, Denver, Colorado 80295, 303-830-3692.

CONTENTS

	Page
State Studies and Blue Ribbon Commissions	1
Issues Related to Coordination and Governance	6
o Changes in state structure	8
o Coordination versus governance	11
o New themes in proposals for improved state coordinatioin	12
o Points to consider related coordination	14
Suggestions for Blue Ribbon Commissions or Task Forces	15
Appendix	
Major State Higher Education Studies 1980 to Present	

Despite differences across the nation, a number of states are facing remarkably similar issues regarding the future of their higher education systems. In fact, for the remaining years of the 1980s, the relationship between state government and higher education is likely to be more intense, complex and potentially troublesome than in any period in the past decade. Renewed recognition is being given to the central role that the higher education system plays in the states' economic future: in the ability to attract new industry and in the state's overall social, economic and cultural well-being. This is fueling a new sense of urgency regarding the effectiveness and responsiveness of the state's systems for governing and financing higher education. It is not uncommon to hear a governor or state legislator remark, "We can't hope to compete with other states for new industry and jobs if we keep spreading our limited state resources across too many mediocre institutions, and we can't get our act together amid the intense bickering among various institutional interests." Or, "I'd be willing to put much more money into higher education if only I had confidence that the priorities were more clearly defined, the missions of institutions more sharply focused, and confidence that the existing coordinating structure was making tough choices among competing options."

State Studies and Blue Ribbon Commissions on Higher Education

As an indication of growing state concerns, thirteen states in March 1986 had special studies or blue ribbon commissions. These range from comprehensive studies of the future of higher education to more narrowly defined examinations of issues such as governance or independent higher education. Another eight states completed such studies in 1985 or early 1986. As indicated in Table I, a number of the studies were under the direction of a legislative committee or of a commission or task force established by the governor or legislature.

Table I

Major State Higher Education Studies [a]
1985-1986

Period	Legislative Committees	Study Commission Est. by Gov/Leg	Study by Board	Consultant Team Report
January 1985 to January 1986	Idaho (2)	Colorado Maine Pennsylvania	Florida New York	Mississippi So. Carolina
1986	California New Mexico Wisconsin	California Connecticut (1) Maryland New Jersey (1) New Mexico Oklahoma Rhode Island Texas	Missouri No. Dakota Wisconsin	Louisiana No. Carolina

(1) State policy and independent higher education
(2) Idaho interim committee on governance and community college issues.

(a) Does not reflect state boards undertaking special studies in conjunction with statutory planning responsibilities

ECS:5-2-86

Not reflected in Table I are the planning activities and special studies by state higher education boards carried out in accord with their statutory responsibilities. For example, boards in Alaska, Connecticut, Kentucky, Maryland, Missouri, Nevada, New York and West Virginia either completed or are in the final stages of revising strategic or master plans. The coordinating boards in states such as California, Florida, Illinois, Minnesota, New Jersey, Ohio and Virginia are engaged in a series of special studies in the course of their continuing planning responsibilities.

The Issues Motivating Initiation of State Studies. Several issues appear with relative consistency across the state studies of the past two years.

- **A need for a strong tie between higher education and the state's economy.** Since 1981, most states have taken a variety of actions to improve the connection between the state's investment in higher education and the state's economic future. These have ranged from establishing or strengthening engineering programs, promoting partnerships between the major research university and business and industry, improving the coordination between state agencies responsible for jobs programs and those responsible for vocational education, and offering free or low cost vocational training for firms willing to locate new plants in the state or to expand existing facilities. Many of the elementary/secondary reforms have been advanced as means to strengthen the state's economy. While some states are beginning to take a second look at some of the initiatives of the early 1980s, economic development remains one of the principal political arguments for the need to reform higher education.

- o **An overall mismatch between the way higher education is organized and delivered and the changing educational needs of the state and its people.** State studies have addressed a broad range of issues, many focused on the quality of undergraduate education, related to the adequacy of the current system in the face of future demands. Issues include:
  - * Changes in demography;
  - * Demands for broader education and a higher level of skills for success in a changing work force and society;
  - * Inadequacy of students' preparation for college-level work, growth of remedial programs, declining college-participation, and high attrition rates - all at a time when there is a need for a more literate and skilled population;
  - * Evidence that what is known about effective teaching and learning is frequently not being applied to meet the needs of an increasingly diverse student population; and
  - * The desire to find constructive ways of assessing student progress and institutional performance while maintaining the nation's commitment to access and equal opportunity.
- o **A recognition of the connection between the quality of higher education and the quality of the public schools.** Many of the recent state higher education studies were established as a direct follow up to the elementary and secondary education reform movement. States recognize that the quality of teacher education relates directly to the quality of undergraduate education in the state's colleges and universities. They also recognize that through admissions standards and other devices, higher education does much to set expectations for the secondary schools in the state. Effective state actions to address higher education issues are seen as intertwined with those related to elementary and secondary education.

- o **Concerns that the higher education system may be over extended.** A consistent theme, one heard with increasing frequency, is that limited public resources are being spread over too many institutions with too little attention being given to quality and unique missions. Assertions are made that the current state system is failing to differentiate among institutions and programs according to quality and state priorities.

Of course, the condition of the state's economy has much to do with the focus of any given task force. For example, the current study groups in North Dakota, New Mexico, Oklahoma and Texas are beginning their work in the face of severe economic conditions. In contrast, the studies in California, Maine, Maryland and South Carolina, faced more optimistic conditions.

Throughout the past 15 years, several other perennial issues have motivated governors or legislators to establish special higher education study groups. The urgency of these issues is increased when a state faces severe economic conditions. Examples of these include the following:

- o **Actual or potential duplication of high-cost graduate and professional programs.** The issue may arise in a variety of ways: through pressures of a growing urban area to have accessible graduate and professional programs which would duplicate or threaten support for similar programs at the state's major research university (frequently located away from major urban areas), or through successful efforts of influential legislators or "end-runs" by institutions to get legislative approval of new programs.
- o **Visible conflict between the aspirations of two institutions (often under separate governing boards) located in one geographic area.** Major reorganization proposals (merger, consolidation, etc.) usually occur after years of less dramatic efforts to achieve improved cooperation and coordination.
- o **Legislative reaction to intense institutional lobbying.** As the governor and

legislature face politically difficult and unattractive choices, increasingly focused on curtailment rather than expansion of programs, intense lobbying by competing institutional interests becomes a major irritant. State task forces frequently seek ways to push the battles away from the immediate political process in the hope that they can be resolved within the higher education community.

- **Proposals to close, merge or change the missions of institutions.** The issue may involve small, isolated rural institutions or institutions that are in close proximity. There is often a sense that the current system is unable to contain political actions that appear to be contrary to good planning and efficient use of resources. For example, an influential legislator may succeed in blocking action to change the mission or close an institution in his or her district because of serious economic consequences for the area; or a legislator may succeed in getting a bill enacted to change the mission of an institution in his or her district despite evidence that the new mission is inappropriate.
- **Concerns about the need for improved coordination among the many institutions offering one- and two-year vocational, technical or occupational programs.** In the past five years, more than twenty states have addressed issues concerning coordination and governance of community colleges and technical institutes.
- **Concerns about the effectiveness of the state coordinating or governing agency.** In some but not all the studies, proposals for reorganization are on the study group agenda. This results from a sense that the existing higher education structure is ineffective in addressing the issues for which it was established or which are not on the state agenda.

Issues Related to Coordination and Governance

The status of state structure as of 1986 according the the broad categories of "consolidated governing board" and "coordinating board" is shown in Table II. The table lists the states according to the extent of the authority of the principal higher education board or agency. Twenty-three (23) states have consolidated governing boards for all or most of these public higher education institutions. These boards have responsibilities much the same as those of a board of directors of any nonprofit corporation. They hire the campus chief executives, establish and implement policies related to all dimensions of the institutions, allocate resources among the institutions, and serve as advocates for the interests of the institutions in the state political and budgetary processes.

Twenty-eight (28) states have coordinating boards that carry out planning, policy formulation, regulatory and administrative functions on behalf of state government. These boards do not govern institutions, although in some cases they have broad authority to influence the direction of higher education in the state. They do not hire campus chief executives. Four states states (Alaska, Oregon, Florida and New Hampshire) have both a consolidated governing board or multicampus system for their senior institutions as well as a coordinating or planning agency and are listed twice in Table II.

Three states (Delaware, Nebraska and Vermont) have higher education planning agencies with limited authority. In each of these states, higher education governance is the responsibility of two or more boards.

Moving from left to right in Table II, the states with the most comprehensive statewide governing boards are listed on the left, whereas the states with coordinating boards or state agencies with only limited planning authority are listed toward the right. The extent of a state agency's authority to approve academic programs, followed by the board's role in the budgetary process, are used to place states in different columns.

The organizational structure, authority and staffing of the higher education

Table II
Authority of State Boards of Higher Education
1986

Consolidated Governing Board		Coordinating Boards						Planning Agencies
		With Program Approval Authority			With Program Review and Recommendation Authority Only			
Board for All Public Institutions	Board for All Senior Institutions--Separate Agency for Community Colleges	Consolidated or Aggregated Budget (d)	Budget Review and Recommendation (f)	No Statutory Budget Role	Consolidated or Aggregated Budget (d)	Budget Review and Recommendation	No Statutory Budget Role or Program Approval	
Alaska	Ariz.	Ala.	Colo.	N.Y.(a)	Ark.	Alaska (b)	N.H.(b)	Del.
Ga.	Florida (a)	Conn.	Ind.		Fla(a)(b)	Calif.		Neb.
Hawaii	Iowa	Ill.	Ky.			Mich.(a)		Vt.
Idaho(a)	Kan.	Md.	La.			Minn.		
Maine(c)	Miss.	N.J.	Mo.			N.M. (g)		
Mass.	N.H.(b)	Ohio	Pa. (a)			Ore. (b)		
Mont.(a)	N.C.	Okla.	Tenn					
Nev.	Ore.	S.C.	Texas					
N.D.	Wyo.		Va.					
R.I.	Wis. (e)		Wash.					
S.D.								
Utah								
W. Va.								

Notes:
(a) States with agency responsible for all levels of education.
(b) Separate statutory coordinating agency.
(c) Maine Maritime Academy and Vocational-Technical Institutes are under other boards.
(d) Separate institutional budgets may be included in consolidated or aggregated budgets.
(e) State Board of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education is separate from Board of Regents.
(f) Several boards develop the formula on the basis of which allocations are made to institutions.
(g) Statutory authority related to programs provides only for approval of new graduate programs only.

Education Commission of the States
5/86

systems listed under "consolidated governing board" vary far more than the two categories listed in Table II. The boards in Alaska and Wyoming are essentially responsible for single institutions. The boards in Florida, Georgia, Maine, Massachusetts, Montana, Nevada, New Hampshire, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oregon, Rhode Island, Utah, West Virginia and Wisconsin, have governing responsibility for a number of separate institutions. With three exceptions, each of these boards has a chief executive officer with the title of chancellor or president who has line authority related to the campuses. The exceptions are Montana, North Dakota and Rhode Island where the chief staff person is a commissioner with leadership responsibility but not line authority related to the campuses. In Arizona, Idaho, Iowa, Kansas, Mississippi and South Dakota, the boards have executive officers who are responsible primarily for staff support to the board rather than policy leadership and line authority for the system.

Also not reflected in Table II are the variety of governing board arrangements within states with coordinating boards. These range from states in which each institution has its own governing board (Washington, for example), to states in which all institutions are under two or more consolidated governing boards or multicampus universities (California, Connecticut, Illinois and Tennessee, as examples), to states with a mixed pattern of single institution boards, consolidated governing boards, and multicampus universities (Colorado and Maryland, as examples).

Other subtle differences among states that cannot be shown in an illustration underscore the danger of attempts to transpose one state's structure to another. For example:

- **Different roles of the legislative and executive branches of state government.** In some states, the legislature plays the dominant role and effective relations with that branch of government are essential to the success of the coordinating or governing mechanism. In other states, the governor is the key figure.
- **Different traditions regarding the state role in relation to institutions.** In some

states, the government has traditionally treated all public institutions as state-owned and regulated agencies. The institutions are subject to the same procedural controls applicable to other state agencies. In other states, institutions are treated as state-assisted, privately controlled entities and are exempt from most state procedural controls. In still other states, the pattern is mixed.

- **Intangible, subtle differences in tradition and quality of leadership.** What makes all classification difficult is that perhaps the most important distinguishing features of any state's higher education system relate to matters of tradition and leadership. While traditions may endure, the leadership capabilities of board members, the staffs of statewide agencies, and the chief executive officers of institutions change. A board that is recognized as strong and effective at one point may be seen as weak and ineffective at another, primarily because of changes in the composition of the board and behavior of board members. Far more than the formal authority of a board, the factors that most frequently define board effectiveness are the prestige and quality of board members; the ability of the board to function as a cohesive group rather than as a collection of individual interests; the ability of the board to organize its work to emphasize policy rather than administration through careful design of agendas and effective use of committees; and the reputation of the board staff among both political and institutional leaders for its objectivity, fairness, sound judgment and commitment to conflict resolution.

Changes in state structure. With the exceptions of only a few states, the basic patterns of state-level organization of higher education across the nation today were in place in the early '70s. The year 1972 marked the culmination of more than a decade of development of state higher education agencies formed to coordinate the massive expansion of higher education in the late '50s and '60s. By that year, 47 states had established either consolidated governing boards responsible for all senior institutions

(and in some cases, community and junior colleges also) or coordinating boards responsible for statewide planning and coordination of two or more governing boards. Three small states with a limited number of institutions continued to handle statewide higher education issues through the existing governing boards and direct involvement of the governor and the legislature without a special statewide coordinating or governing agency.

Through the '70s, 12 states made changes in higher education structure that could be characterized as significant: seven states that had previously adopted a coordinating board as opposed to a statewide governing board took steps to strengthen that coordinating function, either modifying the authority of the existing agency or replacing that agency with a new body with increased regulatory authority. Two states replaced their coordinating bodies with statewide governing boards. The other three states made adjustments in their structures that reflected their unique political and structural situations.

In general, the period of the '70s was one of maturation of the coordinating and governing patterns established in the previous decade. It was a period, however, of continued strengthening of the authority of state boards. Of even greater significance, the '70s saw a major increase in the involvement of other executive branch agencies and legislative staffs in higher education affairs, especially in budgetary matters. Increasingly sophisticated legislators, backed by professional staffs, became more directly involved in both the substance and procedures of state higher education policy.

In the early '80s, the pattern of the '70s continued. Major changes occurred in only a few states. Several states (Florida, Minnesota, North Carolina and Tennessee, as examples) reorganized state-level governance of community colleges, vocational-technical institutes and related programs. Other states such as Pennsylvania reorganized and consolidated the governance of major higher education sectors. Rhode Island abandoned its single board for all levels of education and established a separate

governing board for its three public higher education institutions. The most far-reaching changes occurred in Massachusetts, where a new statewide governing board was established to replace all existing state agencies and boards and in Connecticut, where the idea of a single governing board was rejected and a new and strengthened coordinating board was established.

In 1985, approximately ten states considered higher education reorganization proposals. Major changes were enacted only in Colorado and Washington where existing coordinating boards were replaced by similar but strengthened coordinating bodies. In both these cases, a range of alternatives were debated including a single statewide "superboard" and consolidation of a number of institutional boards under segmental boards. In early 1986, proposals were considered but not adopted in at least six states (Idaho, Louisiana, Maine, Mississippi, New Mexico and South Carolina). The Governor of West Virginia proposed that the State Board of Regents be replaced by a coordinating commission whose members would be three full-time salaried commissioners. The proposal would also have increased the authority of institutional governing boards. The proposal was rejected by the legislature and the existing structure was continued for two years. In two states (Idaho and Mississippi) with single governing boards for several senior institutions, proposals were considered but not adopted to strengthen the board's staff by changing from an executive director to a chancellor with line authority and responsibility for a single university system. New Mexico changed the name of the existing coordinating board but did not alter the basic authority of the agency. In Maine, proposals to remove the land-grant university campus from the system were debated but not adopted. And in Louisiana, the legislature continues to debate proposals for a constitutional amendment to replace the current coordinating board and institutional management boards with a single consolidated governing board.

Coordination versus governance. A frequently asked question is this: Has there been any discernible trend toward single statewide consolidated governing boards such as were adopted in North Carolina and Wisconsin in the early '70s and in Massachusetts in 1980? In most of the states that have undergone major reorganization in recent years, the option of a single governing board has been considered along with a variety of other options. What may be most significant is that in the 15 or more states where this option has been considered in the past 10 years, it has been adopted in only one. In all others, the choice has been to retain but strengthen an existing coordinating mechanism while maintaining a separate system of institutional governance.

Despite differences in formal authority, both coordinating boards and consolidating governing boards have been criticized by governors and legislators in a number of states because of a tendency to focus on administrative, ministerial or internal governance issues and to give insufficient attention to the difficult policy issues facing the state. What these states appear to be seeking is not necessarily more centralized governance or strong regulatory control but more effective policy leadership from the state's higher education board.

Many statewide coordinating and governing boards, as they carry out their responsibilities in no-man's land between state government and the institutions, will face proposals for their elimination in just about every legislative session; few of these advance beyond the bill stage. In states where serious reorganization proposals are made, political leaders frequently express opinions that the existing board (or its staff) is providing ineffective leadership or that it lacks the political influence and judgment to deal with critical issues facing the state. "Critical issues" may be defined as long standing conflicts such as mentioned above. In many of these cases, the sense is that existing board has been focusing more on detailed administrative or internal management affairs rather than the strategic policy issues facing the system or the state. Reorganization is often proposed not simply because the formal authority of the previous

structure was insufficient but because of a desire to change the leadership and personalities involved in the process.

New themes in proposals for improved state coordination. Several themes have been emphasized with increasing frequency in task force reports:

- **Increasing need for more effective state policy leadership.** This is reflected in calls for actions by state boards and their executives as well as institutional leaders to set forth a vision for how higher education can contribute to the state's future, raise the level of the state's aspiration for the quality of its higher education system, and pursue strategies that will resolve long-standing policy dilemmas. As I just suggested, there may be a sense that the existing way the state is organized does not provide a means for these broader issues to be raised and addressed. Or, state leaders may feel that the intensity of political battles about one issue or another in higher education is hurting not only higher education but the state as a whole.
- **Continuing interest in decentralization and deregulation.** A countervailing tendency to the interest in stronger state policy leadership is the continuing interest, motivated by trends in the private sector and other governmental arenas, in decentralization and deregulation. Options either already adopted by some states or under consideration by others include:
  - **Increasing recognition of importance of institutional governing boards.** Actions include: efforts to improve the quality of gubernatorial appointments to governing boards; encouraging greater participation of board members in training programs; and increased delegation to boards of management responsibilities previously controlled by one or more state agencies. Also related to this are conscious efforts to establish conditions that are conducive to attracting, retaining and rewarding effective college and university presidents.

* **Increasing financial management flexibility for institutions.** The most extensive changes involve a significant reduction in the number of line items in the state budget and delegation of extensive authority to institutions for shifting of funds among programs and accounts, for carryover of funds at the end of the fiscal year, and for retaining and investing institutional revenues. In other states, detailed procedural controls in areas such as purchasing and personnel previously handled by executive branch agencies have been delegated to institutions.

* **Promoting institutional renewal through a combination of decentralized governance and increased use of incentives (changes in the base funding systems as well as new competitive categorical grant programs).** These and other changes reflect a growing awareness of the limitations of traditional state fiscal and regulatory controls and an interest in exploring new policy tools aimed at stimulating effective decentralized management and a creative, "bottom-up" renewal within higher education. Deliberate attempts are being made to balance two approaches. On the one hand, centralized improvements will be made in strategic planning and resolution of major policy coordination issues. On the other hand, institutional renewal will be promoted through decentralized management and increased use of incentives rather than traditional policy directives and regulations.

o **Continuing attention to mission differentiation and ways to encourage diversity.** Issues regarding mission differentiation are certainly not new. What is apparent, however, is that despite the best efforts of state coordinating and governing bodies, the politics and basic incentive structures of state systems seem to lead to uniformity and encourage institutions to aspire to a single rather than multiple definitions of excellent and prestige. An underlying issue in several of the recent state studies has been a perception that the existing systems of finance and

governance (including multicampus universities) have tended to spread limited resources uniformly among institutions rather than target resources in ways that respect and encourage diverse institutional missions.

Points to consider related to coordination. Recognizing that task forces frequently will consider proposals to change the state coordinating structure, we encourage them to consider several points first:

- **Have a vision of the future of higher education in the state and a clear definition of the obstacles to achieving that vision, whether they be leadership, resources, governance or other problems.** Change may be necessary to improve the capacity of or provide authority for the existing structure and its leadership to articulate such a vision and play an effective role in helping the governor, legislature and higher education community address the central issues. Yet no structure will be effective unless the state's political leaders are willing to support it.
- **See organizational structure and reorganization as means rather than ends in themselves.** Following from the previous point, more than a few states have embarked on reorganization without a deliberate effort to identify and clarify the real issues facing the state. For example, bills proposing governance changes without strong, substantive arguments for why the changes are necessary can lead to endless debates about power relationships and "the number of boxes on the chart."
- **Examine the total higher education policy process, not just the formal higher education structure.** In a number of states, the focus has been on the authority and functions of single agencies or groups of state-level boards without thorough consideration of the unique roles played by the governor, legislature and executive and legislative branch staffs in that state. In states where higher education policy has traditionally been formed in a highly political atmosphere involving the governor and the legislature, it is unlikely that a new structure that attempts to

remove higher education decisions from politics will be effective and survive. Also important are the formal and informal relationships that make up the state higher education policy process.

- **Recognize that there is no perfect system, no preferred model.** State coordination of higher education is perhaps the most complex balancing act in state government. Conflicting interests are the reality. State interests are not the same as institutional interests, and despite assertions to the contrary, state interests are not simply the sum of the interests of all the institutions in the state. An effective structure is one that draws these conflicting interests together in a way that differences and tensions are resolved before they erupt into major political controversies.

Suggestions for Blue Ribbon Commissions or Task Forces

Based on the experience of other states that have completed blue ribbon commissions or task forces to evaluate their higher education systems, the following suggestions should be considered by any state considering a similar effort:

1. **Take an "all one system" approach.** The issues in higher education are inextricably tied to elementary and secondary education. Actions taken by colleges and universities can have both positive and negative effects on the schools. Just as one example, efforts to increase academic requirements for college admission may unintentionally restrict efforts of middle schools and high schools to keep "at risk" adolescents in school and design programs to meet these students needs. Yet the success of these secondary programs may be the key to increasing the postsecondary participation of certain student groups. By "all one system" it is not suggested that a formal organizational structure for all levels of education be

established. It is only a way to think about the issues. If organization is needed, ad hoc joint committees between state boards, temporary study groups between universities and schools or other short-term means focused on a specific problem are likely to be most effective.

2. **Take a comprehensive view of how the system of finance affects the higher education system.** Often states will look only at one element of the system at a time, ignoring other elements and the way the system works as a whole. The state formula, tuition policy, student aid policy (loans as well as grants), and tax policy all influence the behavior of students and institutions. As suggested earlier, the formula can be modified in ways that encourage institutional renewal and reallocation of resources.

3. **Focus on a limited number of issues.** A major service the task force can provide is to raise the level of public debate about three to five strategic issues facing higher education in the state over the next decade. Attempts to tackle every major issue may lead to frustration and diminished impact.

4. **Distinguish between issues that can be addressed immediately and those which will require attention over time.** Few major issues can be solved through single policy choices. What may be most important is for the state to have a mechanism in place to identify and confront the issues and to develop solutions with extensive involvement of both the higher education and political communities. If such a mechanism does not exist, recommendations should be considered to have one established. The task force should see its role as starting the state on a journey that may take several years and will be led by other parties (the legislature, the state's higher education board) at different points along the way.

5. **Distinguish between "system" issues and "institutional" issues.** Most of the issues a state task force should address concern the higher education system as a whole, not the functioning of specific institutions. Many of the issues raised before the task

force will be matters that should be addressed primarily by institutional governing boards, presidents and faculties. The task force has a unique responsibility to focus on the issues that transcend the concerns of any specific institution.

6. **Recognize the importance of stable, effective institutional governance.** More important than any other factor to the quality of a state's higher education system is the leadership by institutional governing boards and presidents. Financial support is important, but without strong boards and presidents, a system will not meet its potential. The state political leaders have a major responsibility to see not only that outstanding appointments are made to these boards but that state actions reinforce the ability of these boards to carry out their responsibilities in a consistent and effective manner. Attracting and supporting outstanding presidents is perhaps the most important of those responsibilities.

7. **Raise the level of the state's aspirations for excellence.** In our work with states, we have found one state characteristic more than almost any other (including even the level of resources) to be associated with an outstanding higher education system: a commitment of the states' political and institutional leaders to pursuit of excellence in all that is undertaken. In some states you will be hear people say, "That may be possible in California or Michigan, but we could never do that here." Such an attitude becomes a self-fulfilling prophecy. It is reflected not only in the level of state financial support but in the quality of appointments to boards, in the strength of presidential leadership, and the moral and productivity of faculty members in teaching, research and service. The other tendency is for states and

institutions to define excellence only in terms of the model of the large research university. Each institution - whether technical institute or doctoral-granting university - should strive to be a leader among its peers. There should be multiple pyramids of excellence. The state should aspire to be a leader in all that it undertakes in higher education. A state blue ribbon commission or task force can play a key role in setting that tone for future state actions.

The complexity and intensity of the state government's relations with higher education over the next decade will demand new and creative solutions. What worked in the past may not be adequate today. State and institutional leaders share responsibility for ensuring that mechanisms are established to resolve major conflicts while advancing essential values and interests of both the states and higher education.

References

Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges. Recommendations for Improving Trustee Selection in Public Colleges and Universities. A Report from the National Commission on College and University Trustee Selection. Washington, D.C.: AGB, 1980.

Boyer, Carol M., and McGuinness, Aims C., Jr. "State Initiatives to Improve Undergraduate Education: ECS Survey Highlights," AAHE Bulletin (February 1986): 3-7.

Ewell, Peter T. Levers for Change: The Role of State Government in Improving the Quality of Postsecondary Education. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1985.

Glenny, Lyman A. State Coordination of Higher Education: The Modern Concept. Denver: State Higher Education Executive Officers, 1985.

Kerr, Clark, and Gade, Marion L. The Many Lives of Academic Presidents: Time, Place and Character. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1986.

Kerr, Clark. Presidents Make a Difference: Strengthening Leadership in Colleges and Universities. A Report of the Commission on Strengthening Presidential Leadership. Washington, D.C.: Association of Governing Boards of Universities and Colleges, 1984.

McGuinness, Aims C., Jr. State Postsecondary Education Structures Handbook: 1986. Denver: Education Commission of the States, 1986.

Millett, John D. Conflict in Higher Education: State Government Coordination Versus Institutional Independence. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1984.

Pettit, Lawrence K., "The Administration of Public University Systems: An Organizing Perspective," When Colleges Lobby States: The Higher Education/State Government Connection. Leonard Goodall, ed. Washington, D.C.: American Association of State Colleges and Universities (forthcoming).

APPENDIX

MAJOR STATE HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES
1980 TO PRESENT

Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.
Education Commission of the States
1860 Lincoln Street, Suite 300
Denver, Colorado 80295

This listing of major state higher education studies should be read with these points in mind:

1. Approximately 21 states develop and maintain a statewide comprehensive or master plan. In most instances, these are revised every two to five years. In a few states, the plan is revised annually.

2. A number of states undertake planning through a continuing series of special studies and reports. The listing, for example, does not reflect that extensive number of studies and reports during the period by agencies such as the California Postsecondary Education Com#ission, the Illinois Board of Higher Education, the Maryland Board for Higher Education, the Minnesota Higher Education Coordinating Board or the New Jersey Department of Higher Education. The nature of this planning activity is reflected in the comments under column three of the listing. As indicated, several states maintain a statewide plan as well as undertake a continuous planning process.

3. The listing includes major studies that emphasize all or most of the state's higher education system. Not included are many specialized studies, task forces or commissions. For example, task forces on teacher education or articulation between secondary and postsecondary education are not included. Several studies related to economic development, science and technology, independent higher education and governance are included because of their apparent significance within a state.

ECS would greatly appreciate corrections or additional information. ECS has copies of most of the studies included in this listing. Please send additional information (including copies of major study reports not in this listing) to Aims McGuinness at ECS.

//s//

MAJOR STATE HIGHER EDUCATION STUDIES
1980 TO THE PRESENT

Aims C. McGuinness, Jr.
Education Commission of the States

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Alabama		(strategic planning by Commission on Higher Education)		Challenge-Obligation-Opportunity, The Imperative for Excellence in Higher Education (report of Council of Twenty-One, a blue ribbon commission, July 1983)	Third Quadrennial Evaluation Committee on Effectiveness of Alabama Commission (1983)
Alaska	Alaska Postsecondary Education, 1986-1990: A Statewide Plan (completed by Alaska Postsecondary Education Commission, December 1985)				
Arizona	Mission and Scope Statements for the Arizona University System (December 1982)	(periodic reports by Board of Regents)			
Arkansas	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by Department of Higher Education)		Quality Development in Higher Education to Meet the Future Needs of Arkansas (report of Quality Higher Education Study Committee, October 1984)	
California	Statewide Five-Year Plan (updated annually by California Postsecondary Education Commission)	(strategic planning through multiple studies and reports by Postsecondary Education Commission)	Joint Committee for Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (1985-1987; to continue in parallel with the Committee for Review of Master Plan - see column 5)	Commission for the Review of the Master Plan for Higher Education (Report on study community colleges, February 1986; report on review of Master Plan due January 1987)	

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Colorado	Colorado Statewide Master Plan for Postsecondary Education (completed by Colorado Commission on Higher Education, 1983)	(strategic planning through multiple studies and reports by Commission on Higher Education)		Sunset Review Committee on the Colorado Commission on Higher Education (June 1982) Report of the Higher Education Committee (to assess and analyze higher education) (January 1985)	
Connecticut	Investing in Connecticut's Future: A Strategic Plan for Higher Education (Board of Governors, draft, February 1986)	(continuous planning through special reports and studies by Board of Governors)		Task Force on state policy and independent higher education (initiated in 1986) Report of the Governor's Commission on Higher Education and the Economy (January 1982)	Jobs for Connecticut's Future (January 1986)
Delaware		(periodic reports by Delaware Postsecondary Education Commission)			
Florida	The Master Plan for Florida Postsecondary Education (March 1984)	(strategic planning through multiple reports and studies by Florida Postsecondary Education Commission)		Report and Recommendations of the Joint Legislative and Executive Committee on Postsecondary Education (March 1980) A Path to Execellence in Public Higher Education in Florida, Report and Recommendations of the Regents Study Commission on Funding for Excellence (January 1985)	

//s//

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Georgia	The Eighties and Beyond: A Commitment to Excellence (report of a statewide needs assessment by the Board of Regents of the University System of Georgia (1983)	(continuous planning by Board of Regents)		Formula for Excellence: Financing Georgia's University System in the '80s (final report of the Study Committee on Public Higher Education Finance (September 1982)	
Hawaii	A Strategy for Academic Quality, 1985-95 (strategic plan completed by Board of Regents, University of Hawaii, July 1984)				
Idaho		(periodic reports by Board of Education (Board of Regents))	Ad hoc Committee on Higher Education (joint legislative interim committee to examine state governance and community colleges, 1985)	The Future of Higher Education in Idaho, Report of the Idaho Task Force on Higher Education (1983)	
Illinois	(see column 3)	(strategic planning through multiple studies and reports by the Illinois Board of Higher Education)			
Indiana	Interim Update of Indiana's Plan for Higher Education (Commission on Higher Education, April 1985)	(periodic reports by Indiana Commission on Higher Education)			
Iowa	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Iowa Board of Regents)			
Kansas	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Kansas Board of Regents)			

//s//

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Kentucky	Strategic Plan for Higher Education in Kentucky, 1985 (completed by Council on Higher Education, November 1985)	(continuous planning by the Kentucky Council on Higher Education)	SCR 30 Study Committee (legislative study committee on ways to strengthen the state higher education system; report due October 31, 1985)	The Prichard Committee on Higher Education in Kentucky's Future (committee formed by Council on Higher Education; final report, October 1981)	MGT of America Professional School Study (review of medical, dental, legal and engineering professional schools, commissioned by Council on Higher Education, completed July 1983); Price Waterhouse management study
Louisiana	Excellence in the '80s: The Master Plan for Higher Education in Louisiana (completed by Board of Regents, April 1984)	(periodic reports by the Lousiana Board of Regents)			(consultant team examining options for consolidation of governance of several institutions, 1986)
Maine	Statement of Goals and Strategies for the University of Maine (statement to guide development of campus five-year plans released by Board of Trustees, November 1985)			Visiting Committee to the University of Maine (governor's commission on the future of the University; final report, January 1986)	
Maryland	Maryland Statewide Plan for Postsecondary Education (completed by Board for Higher Education, February 1986)	(continuous planning through frequent studies and reports by Board for Higher Education)		**Commission on Excellence in Higher Education (blue ribbon commission on the future of higher education in Maryland; still in process, 1986)** Task Force to Study Flexibility in Higher Education (task force dealing mainly with issues of flexibility for budgeting and accountability and equipment procurement for higher education, 1984)	

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Massachusetts	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Massachusetts Board of Regents)			
Michigan			Senate Select Committee on Higher Education (select committee formed to receive and make recommendations regarding Governor's Commission on the Future of Higher Education, 1984-85)	Putting Our Minds Together: New Directions for Michigan Higher Education (final report of the Governor's Commission on the Future of Higher Education in Michigan, December 1984)	
Minnesota	(see column 3)	(strategic planning through multiple studies and reports by the Minnesota Coordinating Board)		Postsecondary Education in Minnesota: A Commitment to Quality, Access and Diversity (final report of Governor's Commission on the Future of Post-Secondary Education in Minnesota, April 1984) Task Force on the Future Funding of Post-secondary Education (final report, December 1982)	
Mississippi	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Board of Trustees of Institutions of Higher Learning)			Restructuring Higher Education Choices and Analysis for Mississippi (State Research Associates, 1985) Pathways to Accountability and Excellence: A Final Report on the Status and Future of Public Higher Education in Mississippi (Academy for Educational Development, June 1979)

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Missouri	Master Plan III Master Plan for Missouri Postsecondary Education (1979) Policy Initiatives for Missouri Higher Education (1984) Strengthening the Investment in Missouri Public Higher Education (report of the Missouri Coordinating Board for Higher Education, September 1984; progress report, September 1985)	(continuous planning through period studies and reports by Missouri Coordinating Board)		Study on the University of Missouri System (Harold Enarson, consultant 1985/86)	
Montana	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by Montana Board of Regents)			
Nebraska	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education)		Toward the 21st Century (report of the Citizens' Commission for the Study of Higher Education in Nebraska, completed December 1984)	
Nevada	Nevada 2000: Future Directions for Nevada's Colleges and Universities (completed by Board of Regents, University of Nevada System, 1983; progress report and update, January 1985)	(periodic reports by Board of Regents)			
New Hampshire					

//s//

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
New Jersey	(see column 3)	(strategic planning through multiple studies and reports by the New Jersey Department of Higher Education)		Commission on independent higher education (initiated in 1986) Toward a University of New Jersey, report of the Commission on the Future of the State Colleges (completed February 1984). Report of the Governor's Commission on Science and Technology (completed December 1983).	
New Mexico	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Commission on Higher Education)	Joint Interim Higher Education Reform Committee (authorized in 1986 and just beginning work on comprehensive examination of higher education in New Mexico)	The Future is Excellence (report of the New Mexico Governor's Commission on Higher Education, completed December 1983) Governor's Higher Education Reform Task Force (initiated 1986)	New Mexico's Public Institutions of Higher Education: A Critique of Mission Statements and Their Context, report to the Board of Educational Finance, Augenblick, Van de Water and Associates, July 1984
New York	The Regents Statewide Plan for the Development of Postsecondary Education in New York State (quadrennial document, updated by annual bulletins; last major revision, 1984)	(periodic updating of statewide plan by Board of Regents for the University of the State of New York)		The Challenge and the Choice, Report of the Independent Commission on the Future of the State University (completed January 1985)	

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
North Carolina	Long-Range Planning in North Carolina (documents on long-range planning, updated periodically; see column 3)	(continuing planning through multiple studies and reports by the Board of Governors, University of North Carolina)		Tomorrow's Expectations: Challenges for Today: Setting Priorities for Postsecondary Education in North Carolina (report of Third Century Project funded by the Z. Smith Reynolds Foundation, September 1985; project is continuing). The Future of North Carolina: Goals and Recommendations for the Year 2000, report of Governor's Commission on the Future of North Carolina (completed 1984) New Challenges for a New Era: Progress through Innovation, Education and Research in North Carolina, report of Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology, 1984.	

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
North Dakota	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Board of Higher Education)		Advisory Panel on the Future of Higher Education in North Dakota (advisory panel to the Board of Higher Education; report on strengthening the state higher education system due in September 1986) Report of the Higher Education Study Commission to the 48th Legislative Assembly (report of special legislatively authorized study committee, completed March 1983)	
Ohio	Master Plan for Higher Education: Opportunity in a Time of Change (completed by Ohio Board of Regents, September 1982; see column 3)	(continuous planning through periodic studies and reports by Ohio Board of Regents)			
Oklahoma	Oklahoma Higher Education: Planning for the 1980s (1980); Planning for the 1980s, Part II (September 1985, State Regents for Higher Education)	(continuous planning through studies and reports by the Regents for Higher Education)		Task force committee for study of higher education (study authorized by legislature in July 1985; final report to be made to Legislature by January 1, 1987)	

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Oregon	(see column 3)	(continuous planning through studies and reports by Oregon Education Coordinating Commission and the Board of Higher Education for the Oregon Higher Education System)	Staff Sunset Review, Educational Coordinating Commission (prepared by Legislative Research, Oregon State Legislature, November 1982)		
Pennsylvania	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by various state agencies and boards)		Governor's Commission on the Financing of Higher Education (final report, April 1985)	
Rhode Island	(see column 3)	(continuous planning through periodic studies and reports by the Board of Governors)		Special Blue Ribbon Commission to Study the Funding of Public Higher Education including Compensation of the Faculty (established by the legislature in 1985; final report due in 1986)	
South Carolina	South Carolina Master Plan for Higher Education (developed by South Carolina Commission on Higher Education and approved in 1980; updated annually)	(continuous planning through studies and reports by the Commission on Higher Education)			Higher Education in South Carolina: An Agenda for the Future (report for the South Carolina Commission on Higher Education by Augenblick, Van de Water and Associates, February 1986)
South Dakota	(see column 3)	(periodic reports by the Board of Regents)			
Tennessee	Higher Education in Tennessee: A Statewide Master Plan (completed by Tennessee Higher Education Commission, May 1985)	(continuous planning through studies and reports of the Higher Education Commission)		Tennessee Comprehensive Education Study (task force examined all education levels, completed December 1982)	

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
Texas	Informing the Future: A Plan for Higher Education in the Eighties (completed by Coordinating Board, Texas College and University System, 1980; see column 3)	(continuous planning through studies and reports by the Coordinating Board)		Select Committee on Higher Education (authoried by legislature in 1985 to undertake comprehensive examination of higher education in Texas; beginning work in 1986)	
Utah	(master plan update by State Board of Regents in process, 1985-86)	(continuous planning through studies and reports by the State Board of Regents)	Legislative interim study committee examined alternative options for governance of education in Utah in 1984.		
Vermont					
Virginia	Virginia Plan for Higher Education (1983 edition by the Council on Higher Education; see column 3)	(continuous planning through studies and reports by the Council on Higher Education)		Governor's Task Force on Science and Technology (Completed in 1983) Governor's Commission on Virginia's Future (recommendations on economic development; education; environment and natural resources; human resources; government and planning; December 1984)	
Washington	(The Higher Education Coordinating Board, established in 1985, is required to develop a master plan to be updated biennially)	(new agency)	Sunset Program and Fiscal Review of Council on Postsecondary Education (report by Legislative Budget Bureau, June 1984)	The Paramount Duty (Report of the Washington State Temporary Committee on Educational Policies, Structure, and Management - including recommendations on higher education governance, January 1985)	Toward a New Beginning: Balancing Local Control with State Coordination and Governance (Report by Lyman Glenny and Frank Bowen on higher education governance and coordination prepared for the Temporary Committee on Educational Policy, Structure, and Management, 1984)

State	State Board/Agency Statewide or Master Plan	State Board/Agency Periodic/Continuous Planning	Study by Legislative Committee	Study Commission	State Board/Agency Consultant Report
West Virginia	Agenda for Action 1985-1990; Master Plan of Goals and Service for Public Higher Education in West Virginia (Approved by West Virginia Board of Regents, May 1985)	(Periodic reports by Board of Regents)	Performance audit of the West Virginia Board of Regents in conjunction with sunset review of the Board. Action on sunset review was delayed until 1986 legislative session at which time the Board was continued to period of two years. Performance audit completed in 1984 by Legislative Auditor.	Revitalization and Renewal (Report of the Benedum Study Project at West Virginia University; Academic for Educational Development, October 1984)	Support, Performance and Protection of Higher Education in West Virginia (Report for Joint Committee on Government and Finance and Joint Subcommittee on Higher Education, West Virginia Legislature, Academy for Educational Development, 1979)
Wisconsin	(see column 3)	Regents Study Group on the Future of the University of Wisconsin System (study group of the Board of Regents; initiated in 1985 with no specific termination date)	Audit of the Effectiveness and Efficiency of the the University of Wisconsin System Administration (approved by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee, March 1986) Select Committee of the Legislature on the University of Wisconsin System (study group in 1985) The University of Wisconsin Board of Regents and Central Administration's Policies and Implementation of Shared Governance (report of the Joint Committee for Review of Administrative Rules, May 1982)		
Wyoming					